

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

MARCUS ANTONIO SATTERFIELD,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	1:23-cv-143
)	
POLICE OFFICER J.F. SEIFERT)	
Now Detective, and ROXBORO)	
POLICE DEPARTMENT,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

This matter is before the court for review of the Order and Recommendation ("Recommendation") filed on February 16, 2024, by the United States Magistrate Judge in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). (Doc. 55.) The Recommendation was served on the parties on February 16, 2024. (Doc. 56.) In the Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends granting in part and denying in part Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, (Doc. 15), granting Plaintiff's service-related motions, (Docs. 19, 30, 31, 32, 34, 37); denying Plaintiff's motions to amend, (Docs. 42, 52); denying Plaintiff's discovery motions, (Docs. 25, 28, 43); denying Plaintiff's summary judgment motions, (Docs. 18, 38, 39); denying Plaintiff's motion for a more definite statement, (Doc. 40); and denying the remaining indeterminate motions, (Docs. 20, 29, 33, 50). Plaintiff timely filed objections to the

Recommendation, (Docs. 58, 59).

This court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the [Magistrate Judge's] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the [M]agistrate [J]udge . . . [O]r recommit the matter to the [M]agistrate [J]udge with instructions."

The Court has appropriately reviewed the Recommendation and Plaintiff's objections and has made a de novo determination which is in accord with the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation. This court therefore adopts the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation, (Doc. 55), is **ADOPTED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants Seifert and the Roxboro Police Department's Motion to Dismiss, (Doc. 15), is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**, and that Defendant Roxboro Police Department is **DISMISSED** from this action.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motions to amend, (Docs. 42, 52), Plaintiff's discovery motions, (Docs. 25, 28, 43), Plaintiff's summary judgment motions, (Docs. 18, 38, 39), Plaintiff's "Motion For More definite Statement of Allegations

contained In Complaint," (Doc. 40), and Plaintiff's indeterminate motions, (Docs. 20, 29, 33, 50), are **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motions for extensions of time to serve Defendant Seifert, (Docs. 19, 30, 31, 32, 34, 37), are **GRANTED** to the extent that Plaintiff may attempt to serve Defendant Seifert at the Person County Sheriff's Department.

In light of adopting the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation, the Clerk is directed to issue the Summons, (Doc. 32-1) and Complaint, (Doc. 2), to Defendant Seifert at the Person County Sheriff's Department. The Clerk shall provide copies of the Summons and Complaint to the United States Marshal for service of process.

This the 14th day of March, 2024.


United States District Judge